DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 743 EC 305 804

AUTHOR	Kiernan, William E.; McGaughey, Martha J.; Cooperman, Paula J.; McNally, Lorraine C.
TITLE	Supported Employment for People with Severe Physical Disabilities: Survey of State and Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies.
INSTITUTION	Children's Hospital, Boston, MA. Training and Research Inst. for People with Disabilities.; United Cerebral Palsy Association, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1991-09-00
NOTE	58p.
CONTRACT	6008745439-89
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accessibility (for Disabled); Adults; Employment Services; *Job Placement; *Job Training; National Surveys; *Physical Disabilities; Program Effectiveness; *Severe Disabilities; State Programs; *Supported Employment; Surveys; Transportation; Trend Analysis; *Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

This report details the findings of a survey of supported employment directors in the 50 state vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies, that sought to identify potential barriers to a variety of supported employment services for persons with severe physical disabilities. Key findings include: (1) 84 percent of the agencies provided services to persons with severe physical disabilities during FY 1989, an increase over the previous year; (2) the number of persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment increased by 27 percent from FY 1988 to FY 1989; (3) the individual placement model is the option utilized most often; (4) a number of transportation issues present major barriers to employment, including availability, accessibility, and affordability; (5) although respondents reported that personal care assistance supports are available initially at the job site for workers with severe disabilities, fewer resources are available following VR case closure; (6) no specific state agency is mandated to provide long-term support services, making the provision of ongoing supports difficult to arrange; and (7) the job training requirement of twice per month and the 20 hour per week minimum requirement are impediments for this population. An appendix includes the survey instrument. (Contains 21 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 743

Supported Employment for People with Severe Physical Disabilities: Survey of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 305804

Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities
Children's Hospital, Boston

Supported Employment for People with Severe Physical Disabilities: Survey of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies

September, 1991

William E. Kiernan, Ph.D.
Director

Martha J. McGaughey, Ph.D.
Research Coordinator

Paula J. Cooperman, B.A.
Research Associate

Lorraine C. McNally, B.A.
Research Associate

Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities,
Children's Hospital, 300 Longwood Ave., Gardner 6, Boston, MA 02115

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the contributions of Michael Callahan and Michael Morris of United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc. to the study's design and instrument development as well as with interpreting the policy-related findings. In addition, we appreciate the extensive cooperation and patience exhibited by the responding Supported Employment Directors in the 50 state VR agencies. A staff person from every state participated in the study. This helped greatly in generating a comprehensive national picture of supported employment for persons with physical disabilities. The names and addresses of the 50 respondents are listed in Appendix B.

This study was funded in part by grant #6008745439 - 89 awarded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation (OSERS), to United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc (UCPA, Inc.). The opinions expressed in this study are exclusively those of staff from the Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities and UCPA, Inc. No official endorsement by RSA or OSERS should be inferred.

Supported Employment for People with Severe Physical Disabilities:

Survey of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies

Executive Summary

Since its inception, the purpose of supported employment has been to provide employment opportunities for persons who, in the past, have been viewed as not employable because they require ongoing supports in order to maintain employment. The Training & Research Institute for People with Disabilities, in collaboration with The United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc., conducted a survey of Supported Employment Directors in the 50 state VR agencies to identify potential barriers to a variety of supported employment services for persons with severe physical disabilities. These included: eligibility determination, funding for long term supports, personal care supports at the job site, transportation services, rehabilitation technology services, and other potential barriers. The results reflect the perceptions of state VR Supported Employment Directors.

Key findings include:

- Eighty-four percent of the state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies reported providing services to persons with severe physical disabilities during Fiscal Year (FY) 1989. The number of Vocational Rehabilitation agencies providing these services increased in 1989 as compared with the previous year (FY 1988).

- The number of persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment increased by 27% from FY 1988 to FY 1989; however, the total percentage of persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment remains low (5.7% in 1989).

- State Supported Employment Directors reported that the individual placement model is the option utilized most often for persons with severe physical disabilities.

- A number of transportation issues present major barriers to employment for persons with severe physical disabilities, including availability, accessibility, and affordability.

- Although respondents reported that PCA supports are available initially at the job site for workers with severe disabilities, fewer resources are available following VR case closure.

- State Supported Employment Directors reported that there are adequate resources to access rehabilitation technology services, when needed, for supported employment; however, they also noted that rehabilitation technology resources are difficult to obtain following case closure.

- No specific state agency is mandated to provide long-term support services to persons with severe physical disabilities, making the provision of ongoing supports (as required through the supported employment regulations) difficult to arrange.

- Respondents generally reported that the Title VI-C job skill training requirement of twice per month and the 20 hour per week minimum requirement are impediments for this population.

- There are differences between state agencies that receive Title III systems change grants and those that do not. States receiving grants showed greater utilization of Title I monies, more diversified resources for PCA services, and an increased likelihood that respondents perceive the minimum hour requirement as a barrier.

Although the absolute number of persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment has increased, this number is smaller than what would be expected given the incidence of persons with severe physical disabilities. The need for ongoing support and designated state agency responsibility for persons with severe physical disabilities is apparent. Additionally, access to assistive technology must improve in practice. In spite of reports that states are beginning to implement technology plans and provide funding for increasing numbers of persons with physical disabilities, in reality, these funds are not routinely available during the determination of employment feasibility and during initial employment (Simpson & Button, 1991).

In conclusion, during the early phase of their establishment, supported employment programs primarily served persons with mental retardation. Increasingly, individuals with other types of disabilities are being served, including those with severe physical disabilities. The development of supported employment services for individuals with physical disabilities brings an accompanying set of unique service needs and policy ramifications. As discussed, the federal supported employment regulations will need to be modified and support service resources will need to be expanded before a substantial number of individuals with severe physical disabilities are likely to enter supported employment nationally.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1
II. METHOD 4
A. Instrument 4
B. Data Collection 4
C. Constraints on Inference 4
III. RESULTS 5
A. Population of Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities in Supported Employment 5
B. Funding Sources 6
C. Cooperative Agreements 7
D. Issues/Problems in Providing Ongoing Services 7
E. Minimum Wage 9
F. Job Skill Training Requirement 10
G. Minimum Hour Requirement 10
H. Average Length of Time in SEP Services 12
I. Additional Barriers 15
J. Use of Supported Employment Models 15
K. Transportation 17
L. Personal Care Services 19
M. Rehabilitation Technology 19
N. Analysis of the Impact of System's Change Grants 22
IV. DISCUSSION 23
V. SUMMARY 33
VII. REFERENCES 35
VIII. APPENDICES:
A. Survey Instrument
B. VR Supported Employment Respondents

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1 Issues/Problems in Providing Ongoing Support 8

Table 2 Effects of Job Skill Training Requirement on Supported Employment Eligibility 11

Table 3 Reasons Minimum Hour Requirement is a Barrier to Supported Employment Eligibility 13

Table 4 Impact of Federal Supported Employment Requirements on Persons with Physical Disabilities 14

Table 5 Percentage of Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities by Supported Employment Model 16

Table 6 Transportation Issues in Metropolitan and Rural Area 18

Table 7 Availability of Specialized Services in Supported Employment for People with Physical Disabilities 21

Supported Employment for People with Severe Physical Disabilities: Survey of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies

Introduction

Since the early 1970's, rehabilitation programs have been demonstrating that persons with severe disabilities are employable (Kiernan & Stark, 1986; Rusch, Mithaug & Flexer, 1986; McLoughlin, Garner & Callahan, 1987). Activities sponsored by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA), Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services and the Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD) have focused on expanding integrated employment opportunities for persons with severe disabilities, particularly supported employment (Bellamy, Rhodes & Albin, 1986; Kiernan & Schalock, 1989; Mank, Rhodes & Bellamy, 1986; Wehman & Moon, 1988).

These federal activities emanated from research which documented that few persons with disabilities were entering employment (Buckley & Bellamy, 1984). Survey findings reported by Louis Harris, Associates in 1984 indicated that two out of three adults with severe disabilities were unemployed (ICD, 1985). Another study estimated that from 60% to 80% of the 20,000 youth with severe disabilities graduating from high school each year will not find employment (Wehman, Moon, Everson, Wood & Barcus, 1988). A survey of consumer satisfaction conducted by Temple University (1990) revealed that more than 70% of the adults with developmental disabilities surveyed were unemployed or in segregated employment settings.

Although the number of persons moving from sheltered or non-work settings to integrated employment is increasing, a national survey of community-based rehabilitation programs

documented that approximately 60% of the individuals served during fiscal year 1985 remained in or entered sheltered employment (Kiernan, McGaughey, Schalock & Rowland, 1988). Similarly, eight out of ten persons served by state Mental Retardation/Developmental Disability agencies were served in segregated (day activity and sheltered employment) or non-work (day habilitation) settings during fiscal year 1988 (McGaughey, Kiernan, Lynch, Schalock & Morganstern, 1991).

Approximately half of the persons served through supported employment nationally are functioning in the borderline to mild range of intellectual functioning (Kregel, Revell, West & Wehman, 1990). As a result, individuals with more severe disabilities who potentially could benefit from supported employment currently may be underrepresented in this service population. For example, only 4% of those placed into integrated employment (competitive, supported and transitional employment) during FY 1986 had cognitive impairments in the severe or profound range (Kiernan et al., 1988).

Furthermore, most individuals with severe physical disabilities have not benefited from participation in supported employment (Bellamy, Horner & Inman, 1979; Kiernan et al., 1988; Mank et al., 1986; Simpson & Button, 1991; Wehman, Wood, Everson, Goodwyn & Conley, 1988). The Third National Employment Survey of Adults with Developmental Disabilities reported that only 3.2% of those placed into integrated employment (including supported employment) had a diagnosis of cerebral palsy (Kiernan et al., 1988). Wehman, Kregel and Shafer (1989) found that 1.8% of the persons served in supported employment nationally during FY 1988 had cerebral palsy and 8.5% had traumatic brain injury, autism and other unspecified disabilities.

Although the prevalence rate for cerebral palsy has been reported as .35% of the general population, studies have estimated that, for those persons who fit the functional definition of developmental disability, 34% to 38% will have a major physical impairment (Kiernan & Bruininks, 1986; Temple University, 1990). Thus, individuals with physical disabilities comprise a substantial proportion of the population with severe functional disabilities, many of whom typically would benefit from supported employment services. Considering this, in conjunction

with the small percentage of persons with physical disabilities currently served in supported employment, it appears that this group is underrepresented in the population in supported employment.

This study examines the current utilization of supported employment services for persons with severe physical disabilities by the fifty state Vocational Rehabilitation programs. A variety of potentially relevant policy issues were analyzed, including:

- possible barriers to supported employment eligibility inherent in the Title VI-C regulations,
- availability of long-term support funding,
- availability of and funding resources for personal care services at the job site,
- availability of transportation services for those in supported employment,
- utilization of rehabilitation technology services in supported employment, and
- additional barriers related to providing supported employment to persons with severe physical disabilities.

Method

Instrument

The survey instrument was developed by project staff at the Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities, Children's Hospital, Boston, in conjunction with United Cerebral Palsy of America (UCPA), Washington D.C. The instrument was then sent to the Council of State Administrators for Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR) for review. The research committee of CSAVR recommended changes to the instrument, and after several rounds of revisions, the instrument was approved.

Data Collection

In early September 1990, a copy of the survey, an introductory cover letter, and a copy of the CSAVR approval letter were sent to Supported Employment Directors (or to the individual with administrative responsibility for the agency's supported employment program) at each state Vocational Rehabilitation agency. These individuals were asked to fill out the survey as completely as possible and to expect a call from the study's research assistant within two weeks. Except for two states, all surveys were completed as telephone interviews. The research assistants followed up the initial interview with calls to other relevant staff or to the initial respondent, if necessary, to clarify information. Interviews were completed with each of the 50 state Supported Employment (SE) Directors by mid-November.

Constraints on Inference

Respondents were told that the study focused on supported employment for persons with severe physical disabilities (identified as those who have a primary physical disability as defined by P. L. 99-506, The Rehabilitation Act of 1986) who require ongoing support services in order to maintain competitive employment in an integrated work setting. Seven SE Directors either reported that there were no individuals who fit the study criteria in their state's supported employment

program during FY 1989 or they were unable to obtain this information. These respondents were encouraged to respond to all relevant policy-related survey questions, nevertheless, and their responses have been aggregated with others. Three SE Directors indicated that although persons with severe physical disabilities were in supported employment, physical disability was not listed as the primary disability, due to eligibility or funding reasons. Again, their responses were included in all applicable analyses.

Many of the state supported employment programs recently have implemented or are in the process of modifying their management information systems, which vary widely from state to state. Thus, the data are affected by the state agency's ability to provide the information requested.

Results

Population of Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities in Supported Employment

Respondents were asked to report the percentage of individuals with severe physical disabilities served in their agency's supported employment programs during federal fiscal years 1988 (10/1/87 thru 9/30/88) and 1989 (10/1/88 thru 9/30/89). These were individuals whose primary disability was considered to be physical.

In fiscal year 1988, 4.5% of the individuals in supported employment, on average, were reported to have a severe physical disability, with 36 states reporting a range from zero to 14%. This percentage was slightly higher for fiscal year (FY) 1989, with 42 state SE Directors reporting that an average of 5.7% of the individuals in supported employment had a severe physical disability. (This is based on an adjusted range from zero to 17%, excluding one state that reported 32%.) Approximately half of the state SE Directors estimated these percentages instead of referring to actual data (19 estimated for FY 1988, 20 for FY 1989). However, the state percentages based on estimates did not differ significantly from the percentages reported from actual data for either fiscal year.

Because many of the state VR agencies categorize supported employment consumers differently, this information should be interpreted with caution. The majority (30 states) reported on persons in supported employment whose primary disability was a severe physical disability, including cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, and other physical and orthopedic impairments. Persons with traumatic brain injury were excluded from the analyses unless it was clear that they had accompanying severe physical disabilities. However, four SE Directors included persons with sensory impairments in their percentages, even though this category was not in our original definition. Finally, while most provided data on the total number of persons served in supported employment, three states provided data on successful closures only.

Funding Sources

VR Supported Employment Directors were asked to indicate, from a list of potential sources, which funding sources their agency used for supported employment. Sources used for both time-limited and ongoing services by the state VR agency were included. All respondents (100%) reported that Title VI-C funds were used. A very large proportion, 80%, also used Title I funds for supported employment.

Sixty percent of the state agencies reported that other state agency dollars were used for supported employment (such as Department of Mental Retardation, Mental Health, etc.), primarily for the provision of ongoing supports. However, this percentage is likely to be larger, because other state agencies also fund supported employment programs directly, in addition to funding follow-up supports. In another survey of state MR/DD agencies, 100% of the respondents from Washington D.C. and 49 state agencies reported that their agency funded or operated supported employment programs (Kiernan, Schalock, McGaughey, Lynch & McNally, 1991).

Twenty percent of the SE Directors indicated that their state VR agency has a line item in the state budget for supported employment. Other sources of funding for supported employment, indicated by 32% of the SE Directors, included general state revenue funds, Social Security funds or Plans for Achieving Self Support (PASS plans), and county funds.

Cooperative Agreements

Respondents were asked whether a cooperative agreement for the provision of ongoing support services, as specified in the Title VI-C regulations, existed between the state VR agency and another state agency or local/regional agency. Nearly all SE Directors (96%) indicated that an agreement does exist between their VR agency and another state and/or local agency.

Most (41) SE Directors indicated that cooperative agreements existed between their VR agency and one or more other state agencies. These agencies and the number of states indicating agreements are as follows: Department of Mental Retardation/Division of Developmental Disabilities (N=32), Department of Mental Health (N=31), and various education agencies (N=2), health agencies (N=5), and other agencies such as Department of Public Aid, Office of Veteran's Affairs, and Commission for the Blind or Deaf (N=5).

Fewer SE Directors (22) reported cooperative agreements between their VR agency and local/regional agencies. These agreements were developed with county or regional mental health departments and/or local mental health centers (N=10); Associations of Retarded Citizens, regional mental retardation/developmental disabilities offices, other local agencies serving persons with mental retardation (N=5); and other local service providers, such as Services for the Blind (N=6).

Issues/Problems in Providing Ongoing Services

Supported Employment Directors were asked what issues or problems their agency had encountered in providing ongoing support services to individuals with severe physical disabilities. As shown in Table 1, more than half (62%) cited a lack of funding for ongoing support or specified the absence of a single funding stream for this population. Some respondents reported use of Social Security PASS plans, state legislature appropriations, and other funding sources for ongoing support but emphasized that funding still remains a problem.

Over one-third (38%) of the respondents reported that the absence of an identified provider

Table 1

Issues/Problems in Providing Ongoing Support

ISSUE	# STATES (N=50)	% STATES*
Lack of funding	31	62%
No designated provider	19	38%
Ineligible due to definition/diagnosis	11	22%
Rehab engineering needs	6	12%
Population does not need ongoing support	4	8%
Other	12	24%

*Sum is greater than 50 states or 100% because respondents often indicated more than one issue or problem.

and a statewide service system impedes the provision of ongoing supports to persons with severe physical disabilities. In many instances, ongoing supports for this population are arranged on a case by case basis.

Less frequently cited issues included: this population is not eligible for long term supports due to definitional/diagnosis issues (22%); there is an absence of rehabilitation engineering services (12%); and this population does not need ongoing support (8%). Nearly one-fourth (24%) of the SE Directors also mentioned "other" issues, such as job development for this population, transportation needs, a lack of guidelines for dealing with this population, a lack of ancillary services and accessibility issues.

Minimum Wage

Supported employment closure in jobs which pay less than the minimum wage is allowable under federal law, as long as long-term supports are arranged. However, actual implementation of this provision may vary, depending on state policy. Thus, SE Directors were asked whether their state VR agency allows supported employment closure (Status 26) in jobs paying less than minimum wage. More than three-fourths (84%) responded positively. Several qualified their responses, however, saying that although VR has the authority to allow these closures, this practice is discouraged in their state and rarely occurs. Some noted that they verify whether the employer has a sub-minimum wage certificate prior to arranging such a closure.

Those who responded that the state VR agency would not allow these closures (16%) were asked whether this policy presents any problems for supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities. Most said the policy has not been an issue thus far. One director reported that the minimum wage requirements present greater eligibility problems for persons with mental illness.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Job Skill Training Requirement

When asked whether the job skill training requirement of the Title VI-C regulations affects supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities, 42% (or 21) of the SE Directors responded positively. The remainder either responded that the requirement did not affect eligibility (48%) or they were not sure (10%). Directors who indicated that the job skill training requirement did not affect supported employment eligibility for this population reported that they either interpret the requirement broadly or have not served this population yet in supported employment.

Those who responded positively were asked, in an open-ended question, to assess how this requirement affects service eligibility. These responses were categorized according to major themes. The number of directors who indicated each category is shown in Table 2.

Over two-thirds (15) of these SE Directors responded that persons with severe physical disabilities may not need job skill training twice monthly if they do not have an accompanying cognitive disability. However, these individuals may need other supports at the job site, including personal care assistance, work-site accommodations, and mobility assistance.

Nearly half (9) of these respondents suggested that the job skill training requirement needs to be defined more loosely, because as written, it often excludes persons with physical disabilities. Some suggested that the regulations should be expanded to include other services a person may need at the job site, including those mentioned above. Four respondents also reported that this requirement was interpreted broadly in their state, allowing other services to be provided in lieu of job skill training.

Minimum Hour Requirement

Respondents were asked whether the minimum hour requirement of 20 hours per week (as specified in the Title VI-C regulations) is also a barrier to supported employment for persons with severe physical disabilities. Two-thirds (62%) responded positively. Approximately one-third (36%) said they did not view the requirement as a barrier and 2% said they did not know.

Table 2

Effects of Job Skill Training Requirement on Supported Employment Eligibility

	# of States (N=21)	% of States
This population does not need job skill training/needs other assistance at work site	15	71%
Job skill training requirement needs to be defined more loosely	9	43%
Currently use a broad interpretation of this requirement	4	19%
Other	3	17%

*The sum is greater than 21 because respondents indicated more than category of response.

Those who responded positively also were asked to explain how this requirement acts as a barrier. These responses were categorized and the results are presented in Table 3. Nearly half (15) of these directors indicated that persons with severe physical disabilities often need a transition period to work up to 20 hours per week by the point of closure. Nearly as many respondents (14) said they thought many persons with severe physical disabilities are unable to phase into working 20 hours per week, due to issues involving stamina and fatigue. Others (5) stated that the requirement acts as a barrier, but they have found alternatives, such as using Title I funds. Finally, four respondents indicated that their agency uses a flexible interpretation of this requirement. Table 4 shows the state-by-state distribution of responses regarding potential barriers in the two criteria described in the Title VI-C regulations (the job skill training requirement and the 20 hour per week requirement).

Average Length of Time of SEP Services

When asked to provide the average length of time that supported employment services were provided to individuals funded under Title VI-C for the past two years, most (78% or 39 directors) were able to respond with either data or an estimate. They reported that the average length of time that supported employment services were provided to these individuals was 7.3 months. Those who had actual data reported fewer months (N=16, 6.7 months) than those who gave an estimate (N=23, 7.8 months). The remaining SE Directors (22% or 11 directors) said they did not know this information.

Respondents also were asked whether their state agency specifies a maximum period of time for supported employment services provided through Title I funds. Sixty percent reported a time restriction, 16% said "no", 4% said "don't know", and 20% do not currently utilize Title I funds for supported employment services.

Those who responded "yes" were asked to report the time limit. All but one SE director (who reported 9 months) responded that they use 18 months as specified in the Title VI-C regulations, regardless of the funding source (Title I or Title VI-C). A few directors added that the

Table 3

Reasons Minimum Hour Requirement is a Barrier to Supported Employment Eligibility

	# and % of States (N = 31)
Need transition period to work up to 20 hours	15 (48%)
Target population unable to work 20 hours per week/stamina/fatigue issues	14 (45%)
VR agency uses broad interpretation of this requirement	4 (13%)
Other	3 (10%)

*Sum is greater than 31 because respondents indicated more than category of response.

Table 4

Impact of Federal Supported Employment Requirements on Persons with Physical Disabilities

State	Job Skill Training Affecting Eligibility	Twenty Hour Minimum a Barrier
ALABAMA	Yes	Yes
ALASKA	No	Yes
ARIZONA	No	Yes
ARKANSAS	No	Yes
CALIFORNIA	Yes	Yes
COLORADO	Don't Know	No
CONNECTICUT	Yes	Yes
DELAWARE	Yes	No
FLORIDA	Yes	Don't Know
GEORGIA	Yes	No
HAWAII	Yes	Yes
IDAHO	No	Yes
ILLINOIS	Yes	Yes
INDIANA	No	No
IOWA	No	Yes
KANSAS	No	Yes
KENTUCKY	Yes	Yes
LOUISIANA	Yes	No
MAINE	Don't Know	Yes
MASSACHUSETTS	Yes	No
MARYLAND	No	Yes
MICHIGAN	No	No
MINNESOTA	Yes	Yes
MISSISSIPPI	Don't Know	Yes
MISSOURI	No	No
MONTANA	Yes	Yes
NEBRASKA	No	No
NEVADA	No	No
NEW HAMPSHIRE	No	Yes
NEW JERSEY	Yes	No
NEW MEXICO	No	No
NEW YORK	No	Yes
NORTH CAROLINA	No	Yes
NORTH DAKOTA	No	No
OHIO	Yes	No
OKLAHOMA	Don't Know	Yes
OREGON	Don't Know	Yes
PENNSYLVANIA	Yes	Yes
RHODE ISLAND	Yes	Yes
SOUTH CAROLINA	Yes	No
SOUTH DAKOTA	No	No
TENNESSEE	No	Yes
TEXAS	Yes	Yes
UTAH	No	Yes
VERMONT	No	Yes
VIRGINA	No	Yes
WASHINGTON	No	Yes
WEST VIRGINIA	Yes	No
WISCONSIN	Yes	No
WYOMING	No	Yes

18 month limit had not been a problem because, in the majority of cases, this was more than enough time for the training phase of supported employment for persons with severe physical disabilities.

Additional Barriers

Respondents also were asked whether the state VR agency's interpretation of the Title VI-C regulations created any additional barriers. Few (14%) reported additional barriers to supported employment eligibility for this population. Those who did stated a variety of reasons. One director said the state VR agency policy requires a counselor to secure ongoing support from the time of eligibility determination, which makes the process more difficult. Another concurred by saying that the requirement for pre-arranged long term follow-up was a barrier. One SE Director noted that it was difficult to secure funding for ongoing supports beyond the fiscal year period, whereas another director reported that the agency's stringent interpretation of the regulations created an additional barrier.

Use of Supported Employment Models

More than half (30) of the directors were able to provide data (N=19) or an estimate (N=11) of the percentage of persons with severe physical disabilities who were working in the following supported employment models: individual placement, enclave, mobile crew, small business, and other. The percentages based on data and estimates were combined for analyses, as the two groups did not differ significantly.

Table 5 displays the percentage of individuals with severe physical disabilities who reportedly were working in each model. Individual placement was, by far, the most frequently used model with this population, with directors reporting that 85% of persons with severe physical disabilities are in individual placements. In fact, 14 of the 30 directors responding to this question said that they use individual placements 100% of the time in supported employment. According to

Table 5

Percentage of Persons with Severe Physical Disabilities by Supported Employment Model

Average Percentage	Model
85%	Individual Placement
5%	Enclave
4%	Mobile Crew
4%	Small Business
2%	Other

SE Directors, the remaining 15% of persons with severe physical disabilities were spread equally across enclaves, mobile crews, and small businesses, with very few (2%) in other models.

Transportation

SE Directors were asked to rank the three most important issues affecting transportation services for individuals with severe physical disabilities in their state's metropolitan and rural areas. The rankings were used to create an index of issues for both the metropolitan and rural areas.

As shown in Table 6, the three most important issues reported in the metropolitan areas, on average, were the lack of accessible transportation, transportation schedules that are incompatible with work hours, and a lack of funding. With respect to accessibility, directors elaborated on the lack of transportation equipped with lifts, especially on certain routes or at particular times. Many directors mentioned that specialized transportation was often unavailable to persons in supported employment who worked odd hours, night shifts, or sporadically. Other issues included safety concerns, the reliability of public transportation, and limited use of other resources, such as carpooling.

In the rural areas, the three most important issues, on average, were the absence of available public and specialized transportation, lack of funding, and other issues. Other issues included the long distances to be traveled, the lack of sufficient demand to justify services economically, and an absence of disability awareness. Several directors mentioned that persons in rural areas are forced to be more creative in identifying transportation. Alternatives to public transportation in rural areas included: participating in carpools with co-workers, obtaining rides from family or friends, and using senior citizen group vans.

Over three-fourths (78%) of the state VR directors reported that funding was available in their state for specialized transportation assistance for individuals working in supported employment. They qualified their responses, however, by stating that these funds were available only in some communities or regions, were very limited, were only available during the training

Table 6

Transportation Issues in Metropolitan and Rural Areas

Issue	Rank for Metro	Rank for Rural
Absence of lifts/lack of accessible public transportation	1	4
Limited schedules/ incompatible with work hours	2	5
Lack of funding	3	2
Other	4	3
Limited routes/ accessibility to work sites	5	6
Lack of availability of public & specialized transportation	6	1

phase or involved long waiting periods. Several directors also noted that these funds were not earmarked specifically for supported employment.

Of those reporting that specialized transportation funds were available, 82% stated that the state VR agency provides these funds only on a time-limited basis. Many state directors (62%) also reported the use of other agency funds for specialized transportation, such as Social Security PASS or IRWE funds.

Personal Care Services

The majority (88%) of the SE Directors reported that funds for personal care assistant (PCA) services are available to persons with severe physical disabilities who require these services at the supported employment job site. Those who said these funds were available were asked to specify the funding sources. Three-fourths (75%) said that their state VR agency funds personal care services, although many respondents stipulated that VR funds were available only while a case is open. More than half (59%) mentioned Medicaid as a source. Over one-third (34%) mentioned other sources, such as Social Security (PASS plans, Impairment Related Work Expenses-IRWE), Easter Seals, United Way funds and state funding. One director qualified the availability of personal care funds by saying, "These funds are very limited and it's a serious disadvantage for individuals with severe physical disabilities."

Those respondents who indicated that funds were not available were asked how PCA needs are addressed at the supported employment job site. Responses varied, with directors indicating that job coaches, co-workers, employees and employers may provide PCA services.

Rehabilitation Technology

The last section of the survey explored the use of rehabilitation technology, including funding sources, availability and restrictions. When asked whether their state VR agency had a plan that was currently implemented to provide rehabilitation technology to persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment, nearly three-fourths (72%) of the respondents

answered positively. Many indicated, however, that these plans were not specific to supported employment. Instead, rehabilitation technology was available to any VR consumer who needed this service, especially those with severe physical disabilities. Others said they do not have a plan per se, but if technology is required as part of an Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP), it is provided. While some SE Directors said their rehabilitation technology services were enhanced through grant funds, others indicated that they were developing proposals currently for rehabilitation technology grants or that grants had been awarded recently but not yet implemented.

Table 7 displays the state by state distribution for respondents' answers regarding the availability of funds for the provision of PCA services at the work site and for the provision of rehabilitation technology prior to and following supported employment placement. Nearly all (92%) of the directors said funds for rehabilitation technology were available to individuals with physical disabilities for job-related technology before they were placed into supported employment. Nine directors qualified their positive response, however, stating that the time period for funding was restricted (to the diagnostic phase or while the VR case remained open) or that funds were limited.

Slightly fewer (88%) said these funds were available after persons were placed into supported employment. The thirteen directors who qualified their responses said that such funds were available only as identified in the IWRP (as long as VR is providing the services).

All SE Directors (50) indicated that Title I was the primary source of funding for rehabilitation technology services. A few specified sources such as Title VI-C (8%) or other sources (12%), such as PASS plans and IRWE, DD grants and Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) grants.

Respondents were asked whether their state agency required central office approval in order to access rehabilitation technology funds, and, if so, whether this was a hindrance. Nearly three-fourths (71%) of the respondents said central office approval was not required; rather, these decisions were made at the local or regional level. Some qualified their responses, however, stating that central office approval was necessary for expenses greater than a designated dollar

Table 7

Availability of Specialized Services in Supported Employment for People with Physical Disabilities

State	PCA Services Provided at Work Site	Rehab. Tech Available prior to Placement	Rehab. Tech Available after Placement
ALABAMA	Yes	Yes	Yes
ALASKA	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARIZONA	Yes	Yes	Yes
ARKANSAS	Yes	Yes	Yes
CALIFORNIA	No	Yes	Yes
COLORADO	Yes	No	No
CONNECTICUT	Yes	Yes	Yes
DELAWARE	No	Yes	Yes
FLORIDA	Yes	Yes	Yes
GEORGIA	No	Yes	No
HAWAII	Yes	Yes	Yes
IDAHO	Yes	Yes	Yes
ILLINOIS	Yes	Yes	Yes
INDIANA	Yes	Yes	Yes
IOWA	Yes	Yes	Yes
KANSAS	Yes	Yes	Yes
KENTUCKY	Yes	Yes	Yes
LOUISIANA	Yes	Yes	Yes
MAINE	Yes	Yes	Yes
MARYLAND	Yes	Yes	Yes
MASSACHUSETTS	Yes	Yes	Yes
MICHIGAN	No	Yes	Yes
MINNESOTA	Yes	Yes	Yes
MISSISSIPPI	Yes	Yes	No
MISSOURI	Yes	Yes	Yes
MONTANA	Yes	Yes	Yes
NEBRASKA	Not Applicable	Yes	Yes
NEVADA	Yes	Yes	Yes
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Yes	Yes	No
NEW JERSEY	Yes	Yes	Yes
NEW MEXICO	Yes	Yes	Yes
NEW YORK	Yes	Yes	Yes
NORTH CAROLINA	Yes	Yes	Yes
NORTH DAKOTA	Yes	Yes	Yes
OHIO	Yes	Yes	Yes
OKLAHOMA	Yes	Yes	Yes
OREGON	Yes	No	Yes
PENNSYLVANIA	Yes	Yes	Yes
RHODE ISLAND	Yes	Yes	Yes
SOUTH CAROLINA	No	No	No
SOUTH DAKOTA	Yes	Yes	Yes
TENNESSEE	Yes	Yes	Yes
TEXAS	Yes	Yes	Yes
UTAH	Yes	Yes	Yes
VERMONT	Yes	Yes	Yes
VIRGINA	Yes	Yes	Yes
WASHINGTON	Yes	Yes	Yes
WEST VIRGINIA	Yes	Yes	No
WISCONSIN	Yes	No	Yes
WYOMING	Yes	Yes	Yes

amount or for high cost items such as computer equipment or vehicles.

Those who stated that central office approval was required (27%; with the remaining 2% not knowing) indicated that the requirement helps to ensure cost effectiveness and to verify needs. Some said the approval requirement may cause the process to take longer but does not have an adverse effect. A majority (68%) of the respondents said there were no limits to the amount of rehabilitation technology funds available to individual consumers. Many of these directors said the amount of funds available were dictated by case service budgets and individual needs.

When asked whether there were restrictions in the types of technology which could be purchased, the majority of respondents said "no." Many qualified their responses, however, stating again that the purchase of technology was based on individual need and was assessed on a case-by-case basis. Others again emphasized that there were no set policy restrictions but that counselors were limited by their case service budgets. One director indicated that agency policy encouraged accessing the least complex technology possible to meet an individual's needs.

Those who indicated restrictions in the types of technology which could be purchased said that VR could fund vehicle modifications but could not purchase vehicles. One SE Director reported that unproven devices were restricted. A few others stated that structures and buildings, as well as vehicles, could be modified but not purchased.

Analysis of the Impact of System's Change Grants

The Rehabilitation Services Administration initially awarded ten, and subsequently, seventeen state systems change grants for the development of supported employment under Title III of the Rehabilitation Act. Currently, twenty-seven states have systems change grants. Data from several of the survey questions were compared for the 27 states with system's change grants and the 23 states that did not receive these grants. Several trends were observed for the states with these grants. First, there was greater utilization of Title I monies in states which received system change grants (93%) compared with those that did not (65%). Second, a higher percentage of SE Directors in states that received the grants perceived the minimum 20 hour regulation to be a barrier

(77%) as compared with states not receiving grants (48%). Third, states which received the grants were more varied in their sources of PCA funding, with 42% accessing sources other than VR and Medicaid (compared to 25% of those not receiving system change grants). However, there were no differences between the two groups with respect to the percent of persons with severe physical disabilities served, the average length of time spent providing ongoing supports, perception of the job skill training regulations, or the use of rehabilitation technology.

Discussion

A number of key findings emerged from this survey. The Discussion section is organized around five major themes: characteristics of the population served by state Vocational Rehabilitation supported employment programs, special concerns involving transportation and personal care assistance needs, the role of rehabilitation technology services in supported employment for the target population, the influence of the Title VI-C supported employment regulations on services for persons with severe physical disabilities, and, finally, differences between the twenty-seven states which received Title III system change grants and those that did not.

Key findings related to the population served by state Vocational Rehabilitation supported employment programs include:

- Eighty-four percent of the state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies with available data served persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment in FY 1989 (a total of 43 were able to report or estimate data). This represents a slight increase over FY 1988 (78%, with 36 agencies reporting).
- The average percentage of persons with severe physical disabilities served by state VR supported employment programs increased by 27% from FY 1988 to FY 1989 (from 4.5% to 5.7%).
- The number of persons with severe physical disabilities served by state VR supported employment programs remains small compared with other groups served in supported employment.

- Persons with severe physical disabilities are much more likely to be served in the individual placement model (85%) compared with the total population served in supported employment (52%, as reported by Kregel et al., 1990).

The major findings relating to transportation and personal care assistance issues include:

- Transportation issues greatly inhibit access to supported employment for persons with severe physical disabilities in both rural and urban settings. Resources are lacking in rural areas, whereas urban areas exhibit a lack of appropriate or adequate resources.
- Limitations in scheduling and available routes, as well as lack of funding, are problems in both environments.
- Distance to be traveled and a smaller demand for services have resulted in a broader range of transportation alternatives in rural areas.
- PCA supports are available initially for workers with severe disabilities, but fewer resources are available for ongoing PCA services.

The role of technology for persons with severe physical disabilities is evolving. The major findings in this area include:

- Three out of four states had written plans for using rehabilitation technology in work settings, although funding and eligibility limitations were reported by 20% of the respondents.
- Nine out of ten SE Directors indicated that funds were available for technology assistance on the job for persons receiving VR services.
- The inability to fund rehabilitation technology services after case closure in supported employment was noted as a particular problem.

The influence of the Title VI-C supported employment regulations on service eligibility for individuals with severe physical disabilities was raised by some respondents. The following findings relate to this issue:

- Persons with severe physical disabilities are at a distinct disadvantage regarding the provision of ongoing follow-up support services, because unlike other disability groups, no state agency is mandated to provide these services.
- Most state SE Directors (96%) reported that their agency currently has cooperative agreements to provide ongoing supported employment services.
- Twenty-one SE Directors indicated that the job-skill training requirement was an impediment to supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities.

- Of those indicating that the skill training requirement is a problem, over two-thirds noted that this type of service may not be necessary, especially for those without a cognitive impairment.

- The 20 hour per week requirement was perceived by most (62%) to be a barrier to supported employment for persons with severe physical disabilities.

- Even with a transition period, 14 state directors reported that persons with severe physical disabilities may not be able to work up to the 20 hour minimum requirement.

Comparison of the 27 states that received system's change grants with the 23 states that did not receive these grants revealed:

- There was greater utilization of Title I monies in states which received system change grants (93%) compared to those which did not (65%).

- A higher percentage of SE Directors in states which received the grants perceived the minimum 20 hour regulation as a barrier (77%) compared with states not receiving grants (48%).

- States which received the grants were more varied in their sources of PCA funding, with 42% accessing sources other than VR and Medicaid (compared to 25% of those not receiving grants).

Although it is difficult to estimate the number of persons with severe physical disabilities in the general population, the reported percentage of persons served by state VR supported employment programs (5.7% for FY 1989) may be smaller than the number of potential candidates for such programs. Kregel et al. (1990) reported the following percentage breakdowns for individuals in supported employment during FY 1989 for individuals not having mental retardation or a psychiatric diagnosis: persons with cerebral palsy 2.4%, traumatic brain injury 2.3%, sensory impairments 3.4% and other unspecified disabilities 7.2%. Assuming that some persons with traumatic brain injury and some from the unspecified disabilities category would fit the our definition of severe physical disability, our data appear relatively consistent with those reported by Kregel et al. (1990). However, as noted in the introduction, this percentage is substantially lower than the estimated percentage (34% - 38%) of the population with developmental disabilities who have physical disabilities (Kieman & Bruininks, 1986; Temple University, 1990).

Temple University reported (1990) that 20% of a national sample of 13,075 consumers who were self-identified as having a developmental disability needed supported employment services. Although separate information was not reported on the 41% with a physical disability, it is likely that a similar percentage (that is, 20%) of this group also may need supported employment services.

However, it is encouraging that the percentage of persons with severe physical disabilities served by state Vocational Rehabilitation supported employment programs increased from FY 1988 to FY 1989. For the 36 respondents that provided data for both time periods, 33% reported an increase in the number served from FY 1988 to FY 1989. Moreover, 66% reportedly served at least the same number or more. Several SE Directors indicated that they hope to serve more persons with severe physical disabilities in the future. A number of SE Directors also stated that supported employment services are being used more frequently for persons with other types of severe disabilities, such as those with traumatic brain injury.

The range of supported employment models utilized (individual placement, enclave, mobile crew, small business or other) was similar to those documented by Kregel et al. (1990). However, there was a substantial difference in the distribution across the types of models, with the current study reporting an 85% utilization rate for individual placement model for persons with severe physical disabilities compared with 52% for the total population in supported employment as documented by Wehman et al. (1989). The increased use of the individual placement model may reflect a greater need for highly individualized services by persons with severe physical disabilities (such as personal care supports, job site modifications, rehabilitation technology, etc.).

Transportation, as is the case for many in supported employment (Kiernan & Brinkman, 1988), was raised as a major concern for persons with severe physical disabilities. The issues related to transportation reflect availability, reliability, accessibility, flexibility and affordability concerns. Often, in rural areas the transportation is simply not available whereas in urban areas, though available, it either does not provide easy access to persons with severe physical disabilities or there are scheduling issues.

Issues of transportation reliability were raised by several respondents. These issues reflect inconsistencies in regular public transportation schedules as well as the absence of back-up systems when highly specialized transportation arrangements are needed. Concerns regarding flexibility reflect the varied hours and work schedules utilized by persons with severe physical disabilities. Shortened work days, second or third shifts and weekend hours often present transportation problems, due to reduced availability. Finally, affordability issues also emerge with specialized transportation needs. Costs related to distance, non-scheduled hours and specialized equipment were raised by respondents.

Some states have responded to these issues by capitalizing upon economies of scale, particularly in urban areas where transporting several consumers to the same or adjacent locations at the same time has been undertaken. Flexible and creative alternatives are being developed also in the rural areas. The absence of services appears to stimulate greater innovation and utilization of alternative resources in rural areas although distance creates a more complicated picture. Safety concerns, an issue shared by other populations (such as persons who are elderly or children) may inhibit use of public transportation. The passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (PL 101-336) with its emphasis on accessible transportation most assuredly will stimulate increased attention to transportation issues for persons with severe physical disabilities.

Funding for personal care services at the job site appears to be provided primarily through VR monies. As with rehabilitation technology services, this may present a problem following supported employment closure, because VR post-employment services are not allowed for supported employment. Instead, funds from other state or local agencies are required to provide ongoing supports. It is also possible that state agencies which fund ongoing job skill training and supports will not fund PCA services. Although 59% of the SE Directors noted that Medicaid funds are used for these services, Medicaid generally has interpreted PCA services as home-based only, except for individuals served under the Medicaid Home and Community-based Services Waiver. Not all states currently participate in the waiver program, and the number of individuals served is limited in those states that do participate.

However, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (OBRA, Sections 4720 & 4721) would allow PCA services to be provided outside the home for all states as of 1994. (Minnesota currently is serving as a pilot state for this legislation.) PCA services, an option under federal Medicaid guidelines, currently are provided as in-home services by 28 states to non-waiver clients. The OBRA legislation, as currently enacted, makes the provision of these services mandatory in all states as of 1994. Barring any changes in this legislation prior to 1994, funding availability for PCA services at the job-site should increase substantially in all states, a fact that may have a significant impact on the number of persons with severe physical disabilities who are able to secure and maintain employment.

As reported by Wehman et al. (1989), considerable concern has been raised about the absence of ongoing support mechanisms and funding resources for all persons in supported employment. For individuals with severe physical disabilities, this is complicated by the absence of a clearly identified agency responsible for providing follow-up supports. If there is no cognitive impairment, persons with severe physical disabilities often are not eligible for services with state Mental Retardation/Developmental Disabilities agencies. A similar scenario exists with the state Mental Health agency when there is no accompanying psychiatric disability. Thus, agencies which typically provide ongoing supports following VR closure into supported employment often cannot be accessed by individuals with severe physical disabilities. Individuals with severe physical disabilities certainly would benefit from the identification of a single state agency to assume responsibility for ongoing supports, although this is unlikely to happen in a unified manner across states. What is more likely is the path some states have taken (e.g., New York) to earmark specific state line-item funds for the provision of ongoing supports to this population.

Advances in technology can assist persons with severe physical disabilities with accessing employment. Many state directors (72%) indicated that their agencies have implemented rehabilitation technology plans. Funds for rehabilitation technology were reported available both prior to placement and after placement in most states. However, there are limitations regarding the type of technology services, cost and the time period within which services may be provided. This

is particularly an issue following case closure into supported employment, given the interpretation provided recently by the General Counsel of the Department of Education that VR post employment services are not allowable for persons closed in supported employment.

Only thirteen state agency staff reported limitations in the amount of monies available for rehabilitation technology. Most noted that, although there are no specific dollar limitations, broad fiscal guidelines are used to determine how much could be spent. A number of state SE Directors indicated that they anticipated that the new Assistive Technology Act monies would increase the utilization and range of rehabilitation technology services available through supported employment.

However, in a survey conducted by United Cerebral Palsy Association, 66 UCPA affiliates reported a somewhat different perception of the use of rehabilitation technology (Simpson & Button, 1991). The authors noted that almost two-thirds of the respondents reported: 1) assistive technology was not considered, 2) they were uncertain if it was considered, or 3) it was inconsistently addressed during the eligibility determination process. This report also noted a variety of comments from respondents regarding lack of experience, knowledge, and understanding of the value of assisted technology for persons with cerebral palsy as demonstrated by state vocational rehabilitation agency staff. These data suggest that access to assistive technology appears to be a greater problem for those in the early stages of eligibility determination. In essence, the need for these services may inhibit determination of feasibility for employment and act as a barrier for persons with severe physical disabilities. Recently, there has been considerable discussion regarding the federal supported employment regulations. In the spring of 1990, the Rehabilitation Services Administration requested that the existing regulations be submitted for public review and comment. These comments currently are being reviewed by RSA and should be issued through the Federal Register as proposed rules sometime during 1991.

Aspects of the supported employment regulations that have received the most attention are the 20 hour per week requirement and the twice monthly job skill training requirement. Thirty-one SE Directors noted that the twenty hour per week requirement creates a substantial barrier to supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities. Of these directors,

26% noted that some persons with severe disabilities may not even be able to work up to the twenty hour minimum over time, due to a range of physical constraints. Overall, there appears to be consensus that the current twenty hour requirement presents a significant barrier to persons with severe physical disabilities in accessing Title VI-C funded supported employment services.

In accordance with the results of the current study, respondents to the UCPA study (1991) concurred with the impediments created by the 20 hour per week requirement. This report also noted that the 18 month maximum for VR supported employment services is likewise an impediment to persons with cerebral palsy.

Forty-two percent of the SE Directors noted that the regulatory requirement regarding the provision of ongoing job-skills training (versus more generic supports such as job-site accommodation, personal care assistance, etc.) is an obstacle to supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities. SE Directors either perceived that this requirement is totally inappropriate for persons with severe physical disabilities who do not have cognitive disabilities or that the current job skill training requirement needs to be interpreted more loosely.

Generic support issues for persons with severe physical disabilities are complicated further by the lack of availability of post-employment services (such as rehabilitation technology, transportation, PCA and other supports) following closure into supported employment. Persons who could benefit from generic supports may have difficulty obtaining these. This limitation, combined with the difficulty in obtaining funding for ongoing job-related supports for persons with severe disabilities, accentuates the barriers to supported employment for this population.

A comparison of states that received Title III supported employment systems change grants with those that did not revealed some interesting findings. States that received systems change grants were using a greater variety of alternative funding sources for supported employment. A higher percentage (93%) of states which receive systems change grants utilized Title I monies for supported employment compared with states which did not receive grants (65%). In a related finding, Kregel et al. (1990) reported that states receiving the Title III systems change grants reported a substantially greater amount of supported employment funding from agencies other than

Vocational Rehabilitation. Moreover, a higher percentage of SE Directors in states that received systems change grants perceived the twenty hour requirement as an impediment to persons with severe physical disabilities. Finally, states that received the systems change grants reported more diverse strategies for funding support services, such as PCA and other related supports. Forty-two percent of the states that received systems change grants were using resources other than Vocational Rehabilitation and Medicaid to provide financial supports for PCA services. These differences are likely to reflect the additional resources available to these states for developing a supported employment service system.

It appears that the provision of systems change grants has accelerated the development of Title VI-C supported employment programs as well as the use of alternative funding sources (such as, VR Title I funds and other state agency funds). In addition to the trends noted in this study, Kregel et al. (1990) reported additional areas where the states receiving Title III grants had outpaced the other states, including: 1) a larger number of individuals served in supported employment during FY 1989 as compared with FY 1986, and 2) more agencies were providing supported employment services in FY 1989. The systems change approach may to be a useful strategy for other federal initiatives designed to enhance service change. However, as discussed, systems change efforts have not solved all problems related to supported employment services for persons with severe physical disabilities. Regulatory changes and the development of resources for funding ongoing supports still need to be addressed.

Phase two of this study involves surveying providers of supported employment services who were either nominated by state Supported Employment Directors from the VR agencies or by UCPA in Washington as being experienced at serving persons with severe physical disabilities in supported employment. It will be interesting to compare responses obtained at the local level with those provided by the state directors.

The discrepancy between the state agency staff and local UCPA affiliated service providers regarding supported employment issues needs to be examined further. It is understandable that state-level staff may not be aware of all problems at the local level related to the implementation of

supported employment for persons with cerebral palsy. However, it is critical that this information filter up to the state level so that services can be improved for these individuals.

Summary

The current study has verified that supported employment is being utilized for persons with severe physical disabilities; however, the number of persons accessing this service may be considerably smaller than the number who potentially could benefit. The challenge facing supported employment is the development of a wide range of services which will allow persons with severe disabilities, and particularly those with severe physical disabilities, to become more independent through employment. Current regulations appear to inhibit this type of flexible service development, particularly the job skill training requirement and the absence of post-employment services following closure into supported employment. Moreover, the 20 hour per week requirement appears to limit the number of persons with severe physical disabilities who initially enter supported employment. These regulations currently are being reviewed by the Rehabilitation Services Administration.

Another major barrier to supported employment affecting persons with severe physical disabilities is the lack of an identified funding stream for the provision of ongoing support services. This issue needs to be addressed in order for supported employment services to be more accessible to persons with severe physical disabilities.

Additionally, access to assistive technology must improve in practice. In spite of reports that states are beginning to implement technology plans and provide funding for increasing numbers of persons with physical disabilities, in reality, these funds are not routinely available during the determination of employment feasibility and during initial employment (Simpson & Button, 1991).

In conclusion, during the early phase of their establishment, supported employment programs primarily served persons with mental retardation. Increasingly, individuals with other types of disabilities are being served, including those with severe physical disabilities. The development of supported employment services for individuals with physical disabilities brings an accompanying set of unique service needs and policy ramifications. As discussed, the federal

supported employment regulations will need to be modified and support service resources will need to be expanded before substantial numbers of individuals with severe physical disabilities are likely to enter supported employment nationally.

References

Bellamy, G.T., Horner, R.H. & Inman, D.P. (1979). *Vocational habilitation of severely retarded adults: A direct service technology*. Baltimore University Park Press.

Bellamy, G.T., Rhodes, L.E. & Albin, J.M. (1986). Supported employment. In W.E. Kiernan and J.A. Stark (Eds.), *Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities* (pp. 67-84). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Buckley, J & Bellamy, G.J. (1984). *National survey of day and vocational programs: For adults with severe disabilities*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University.

International Center for the Disabled (1985). *Disabled Americans: Self-perceptions--a Harris poll.* New York: Author.

Kiernan, W.E. & Brinkman, L. (1988). Disincentives and barriers to employment. In P. Wehman & M.S. Moon (Eds.), *Vocational rehabilitation and supported employment* (pp. 221-234). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Kiernan, W.E. & Bruininks, R. (1986). Demographic characteristics. In W.E. Kiernan and J.A. Stark (Eds.), *Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities* (pp. 21-38). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Kiernan, W.E. & Schalock, R. L. (1989). *Economics, industry and disability: A look ahead.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Kiernan, W.E., Schalock, R.L., McGaughey, M.J., Lynch, S.A., & McNally, L.C. (1991). *National survey of state information systems related to day and employment programs*. Boston: Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities, Children's Hospital.

Kiernan, W.E. & Stark, J.A. (1986). *Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Kiernan, W.E., McGaughey, M., Schalock, R. & Rowland, S. (1988). *National survey on employment of adults with developmental disabilities*. Boston: Training and Research Institute for Adults with Disabilities, Children's Hospital.

Kregel, J., Revell, W.G., West, M., & Wehman, P. (1990). *The national supported employment initiative: Expanding employment opportunities for persons with severe disabilities.* Richmond, VA: Rehabilitation, Research and Training Center on Supported Employment, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Mank, D. M., Rhodes, L. E., & Bellamy, G.T. (1986). Four supported employment alternatives. In W.E. Kiernan & J. A. Stark (Eds.) *Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities* (pp. 139-153). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

McLoughlin, C.S., Garner, J.B. & Callahan, M. (1987). *Getting employed, staying employed: Job development and training for persons with severe disabilities.* Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

McGaughey, M.J., Kiernan, W.E., Lynch, S. M., Schalock, R.L., & Morganstern, D.R. (1991). *National survey of day and employment programs for persons with developmental disabilities: Results from the state MR/DD agencies.* Boston: Training and Research Institute for People with Disabilities, Children's Hospital

Rusch, F.R., Mithaug, D.E., & Flexer, R.W. (1986). Obstacles to competitive employment and traditional program options for overcoming them. In F.R. Rusch (Ed.) *Competitive Employment Issuses and Strategies* (pp.7-21). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Simpson, J. & Button, C. (1991). *Results of survey on rehabilitation services under the federal rehabilitation act.* Washington, D.C.: United Cerebral Palsy Association, Inc.

Temple University, Developmental Disabilities Center, Research & Quality Assurance Group. (1990). *Report on state and territorial developmental disabilities councils: 1990 national consumer survey.* Philadelphia: Author.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J.T., & Shafer, M. (1989). *Emerging trends in the national supported employment initiative.* Richmond, VA: Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Supported employment, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Wehman, P. & Moon, M.S. (1988). *Vocational rehabilitation and supported employment*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Wehman, P., Moon, S., Everson, J., Wood, W., & Barcus, J.M. (1988). *Transition from school to work: New challenges for youth with severe disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Wehman, P., Wood, W., Everson, J.M., Goodwyn, R. & Conley, S. (1988). *Vocational education for multihandicapped youth with cerebral palsy*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.

Appendix A:

Supported Employment Policy Survey

SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT POLICY SURVEY

Individual completing survey: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone number: ( ) _____

Instructions: This survey is designed to be a phone interview in order to reduce the effort required on your part and enhance the quality of the information received. *Please review the survey questions prior to the phone interview.*

The study focuses on supported employment services for individuals with severe physical disabilities, defined as those who:

- o have a primary disability of a physical nature (e.g., cerebral palsy, quadriplegia, multiple sclerosis);
- o are considered severely physically disabled according to the RSA federal definition;
- o because of their disabilities, require ongoing support services (i.e., supported employment) in order to maintain competitive employment in an integrated work setting.

1. Approximately what percentage of the individuals served in your agency's supported employment program(s) from *October 1, 1987 through September 30, 1988* were individuals with a severe physical disability?

   _____ % of individuals (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

2. Approximately what percentage of the individuals served in your agency's supported employment program(s) from *October 1, 1988 through September 30, 1989* were individuals with a severe physical disability?

   _____ % of individuals (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. In your state, which of the following funding sources are utilized for supported employment? *(Check all that apply).*

____Title VI-C

____Title I

____State VR Line Item Dollars

____Other state agency dollars (*please specify:* _____)

____Other (*please specify:* _____)

____Don't know

4. a) Is there a cooperative agreement for ongoing services (as specified in the Title VI regulations for supported employment) between the state VR agency and another state agency or between VR and another agency at the local/regional level?

_____Yes _____No *[Skip to 5]*

b) If yes, please specify the level of government involved in these agreements:

_____State Agency

_____Regional or local/county agency

c) If yes, please complete the following information:

AGENCY #1:

Agency Name_____

Does this agency provide ongoing supports to individuals who have severe physical disabilities **only** (i.e., no accompanying cognitive or psychiatric disabilities)?

_____Yes _____No

AGENCY #2: (if applicable)

Agency Name_____

Does this agency provide ongoing supports to individuals who have severe physical disabilities **only** (i.e., no accompanying cognitive or psychiatric disabilities)?

_____Yes _____No

5. What issues or problems has your agency encountered in providing ongoing support services to individuals with severe physical disabilities?

6. a) Does your state VR agency allow supported employment closure (status 26) in jobs which pay less than the minimum wage?

_____Yes *[Skip to 7]* _____No

b) If not, does this present any problems for supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities?

_____Yes _____No

Please explain.

7. a) The Title VI-C supported employment regulations state that participants should need intensive on-going support services in order to maintain employment. Ongoing support services are defined as continuous or periodic job skill training services provided at least twice monthly at the work site throughout the term of employment. Other support services provided at or away from the job site are allowed, as long as job skill training is needed.

Has the job skill training requirement affected eligibility to supported employment services for individuals with severe physical disabilities?

_____Yes _____No *[Skip to 8]* _____Don't know

b) If yes, please explain.

8. a) In your opinion, is adherence to the supported employment minimum hour requirement of 20 hours per week (as specified in the Title VI-C regulations) viewed as a barrier to supported employment for persons with severe physical disabilities?

_____Yes _____No [*Skip to 9*]

b) If yes, please explain.

9. a) What is the average length of time (in months) of supported employment services provided to all individuals funded through Title VI-C over the past 2 years?

_____Average #mos (_____based on data _____estimate)

_____Don't know

b) For Title I funded supported employment programs, is there a maximum time period that an individual can be served?

_____Yes _____No [*Skip to 10*]

c) If yes, please specify.

10. a) Does your state VR agency's interpretation of the Title VI-C Supported Employment Regulations create any additional barriers to supported employment eligibility for persons with severe physical disabilities?

_____Yes _____No [*Skip to 11*]

b) If yes, please explain.

11. Of the individuals with severe physical disabilities served in supported employment and funded by your agency, approximately what percentage are employed in each of these models?

_____Ind'l Placement (____based on data ___estimate ____don't know)

_____Enclave (____based on data ___estimate ____don't know)

_____Mobile Crew (____based on data ___estimate ____don't know)

_____Small Business (____based on data ___estimate ____don't know)

_____Other (*please describe:* _____)

(____based on data ___estimate ____don't know)

12. a) Are funds available in your state for specialized transportation assistance (such as lift vans/buses) for individuals working in supported employment?

_____Yes _____No [*Skip to c*] _____don't know

b) If yes, who provides these funds?

_____State VR Agency

_____Other Agencies (*please specify:*_____)

c) Please rank the three most important issues (in order of importance) affecting transportation services for individuals with severe physical disabilities in your state's <u>metropolitan areas</u>.

d) Please rank the three most important issues (in order of importance) affecting transportation services for individuals with severe physical disabilities in your state's <u>rural areas</u>.

13. a) Are funds for personal care services available to individuals with severe physical disabilities who require these services at supported employment job sites?

_____Yes _____No *[Skip to c]*

b) If yes, what are the sources of funding? *(Please check all that apply and skip to 14).*

_____State VR Agency

_____Medicaid (Title XIX)

_____Other (*please specify:*_____)

c) If these funds are not available, how are PCA needs addressed at the job site for individuals in supported employment?

14. a) According to the Rehabilitation Act amendments (1986), rehabilitation technology includes job site modifications; purchase of assistive devices including computers, communication devices, switches, powered mobility and environmental controls; fabrication of devices; as well as rehab technology services and training costs.

Does your state VR agency have a plan *that is currently being implemented* to provide rehabilitation technology services to individuals with severe physical disabilities who are employed in supported employment jobs?

_____Yes _____No _____Don't know

b) Are funds for rehabilitation technology available to persons with severe physical disabilities for job-related technology **before** they are placed into supported employment?

_____Yes _____No

c) If no, please explain.

d) Are funds for rehabilitation technology available to persons with severe physical disabilities **after** they are employed in supported employment?

_____Yes _____No

e) If no, please explain.

f) In your state, which of the following is the **primary** source of funding for rehabilitation technology services?

_____Title VI-C

_____Title I

_____Other (*please specify:*_____)

g) Is approval required from the state Vocational Rehabilitation central office in order to utilize Title I dollars for rehabilitation technology services?

_____Yes _____No

If yes, how does this requirement affect utilization of Title I dollars for rehabilitation technology?

h) What is the average cost per person (to your knowledge) of rehabilitation technology services for consumers with severe physical disabilities working in your agency's supported employment programs?

$_____per consumer (_____based on data _____estimate)

_____Don't know

i) Are there limitations in the **amount** of rehabilitation technology funds available to individual consumers? (*Please describe*).

_____Yes _____No

j) Are there any restrictions in the types of technology which can be purchased? (*Please describe*).

k) Of the individuals with severe physical disabilities served by your agency who received rehabilitation technology services in the past year, please estimate the percentage who received each of the following types of services:

_____Mobility devices (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

_____Communication devices such as Minspeak, speech generation devices, etc. (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

_____Prostheses (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

_____Work station accommodations (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

_____Job site accommodations (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

_____Equipment such as computers, adaptive telephones (___based on data ___estimate ___don't know)

We are considering a study of facilities that provide supported employment to individuals with severe physical disabilities. Please provide the name, address, phone number and contact person (if available) for as many as 5 supported employment programs that have employed at least 8 persons with severe physical disabilities over the last two years.

Program Name	Address	Phone	Contact Person

Thank you for your participation in this study!

Appendix B:

VR Supported Employment Respondents

Millie Ryan
Alaska Div. of Vocational Rehab.
Post Office Box F -- Mail Stop 0581
Juneau AK 99802

Cary Boswell
Division of Rehab Services
P.o. Box 11586/2129 E. South Blvd.
Montgomery AL 36111

Bob Showwalter
Div. of Rehab Services
300 Donaghey Plaza North
P.O. Box 378
Little Rock AR 72203

Geri Tebo
Rehab Services Administration
1300 W Washington, Room 101
Phoenix AZ 85007

Margaret Lamb
Department of Rehabilitation
830 "K" Street, Room 320
Sacramento CA 95814

Carol Tyson
Colorado Rehab Services/Dept of Soc
1575 Sherman Street, 4th floor
Denver CO 80203-1714

Thomas Calo
Division of Rehab Services
10 Griffin Road North
Windsor CT 06095

Barbara Bennett
Div. of Voc. Rehab.
321 E. 11th Street
Wilmington DE 19801

Frank Greenberg
Division of Voc. Rehab
1709-A Mahan Drive
Tallahassee FL 32399-0696

Zeda Yohe
Rehab Services/Dept of Human Serv
878 Peachtree St., NE -- Rm 718
Atlanta GA 30309

Lorraine Hirokawa
Div. of Voc Rehab/Dept of Human Serv.
1000 Bishop St , Rm 605
Honolulu HI 96813

Harlan Watson
Iowa Div of Rehab Services
510 E 12th St
Des Moines IA 50319

Gary Craw
Div of Voc Rehab, Len Jordan Bldg
650 West State, Rm 150
Boise ID 83720

Robert Trammel & Noelle Schofield
Dept of Rehab Services
623 E. Adams, P.O. Box 19429
Springfield IL 62794-9429

Su-Esta Scott & Tom Volger
Office of Voc Rehab
150 W Market St./P.O. Box 7083
Indianapolis IN 46207-7083

Carolyn Bayless
Dept of Social and Rehab Services
300 SW Oakley, Biddle Bldg, 1st fl
Topeka KS 66606

Carol Hatfield, Proj ASSET
Office of Voc Rehab
930 Capital Plaza Tower
Frankfort KY 40601

Kenneth Vince
Louisiana Rehab Services
P.O. Box 94371/1755 Florida Blvd
Baton Rouge LA 70804

Jim Fratolillo
Employment Services/Mass Rehab Comm.
Fort Point Place/27-43 Wormwood St.
Boston MA 02210-1606

Brenda Sutton
Division of Voc Rehab
2301 Argonne Drive
Baltimore MD 21218

Michael Faust
Bureau of Rehab Services
32 Winthrop St.
Augusta ME 04333-0011

Sharon Tipton
Michigan Rehabilitation Services
P.O. Box 30010
LansinG MI 48909

Kim Kezek
Dev. Rehab Services
390 N. Robert St., 5th fl
St Paul MN 55101

Greg Solum
Div. of Voc Rehab
2401 E. McCarthy St.
Jefferson City MO 65101

Carrie Bahr
P O Box 1698
Jackson, MS 39215

Bob Jahner -
MT Supported Employment Project
P.O. Box 4210
Helena MT 59604

Jo Perkins
Div. of Voc Rehab Services
P.O. Box 26053
Raleigh NC 27611

Ken Van Beek
Div of Voc Rehab
1605 E. Capitol Ave
Bismarck ND 58501

Arvin Frazier
Division of Rehab Services
301 Centennial Mall, South - 6th fl
Lincoln NE 68509

Bruce Archambault
Vocational Rehab Division
78 Regional Dr., Bldg B
Concord NH 03301

Bill Wilson
Div. of Voc Rehab-N.J. Dept. Labor
John Fitch Plaza
Trenton NJ 08625

Jose Torres
Div of Voc Rehab/State Dept of Educ
604 W. San Mateo
Santa Fe NM 87503

Glen Peterson
Rehab Div. - Rm 502
505 E. King St.
Carson City NV 89710

Doris Jamison
Office of Voc & Educational Services
1 Commerce Plaza, Rm. 1609
Albany NY 12234

Lee Essler
Ohio Rehab Services Commission
400 E. Campus View Blvd
Columbus OH 43235-4604

Rebecca Cook
Rehab Services Div -- Human Serv
RS49 - Eval. Ctr./5813 S. Robinson
Oklahoma City OK 73109

Sid Larson
Voc Rehab Division
2045 Silverton Road, N.E.
Salem OR 97310

Vance Coover
Office of Voc Rehab
1313 Labor & Industry Bldg
Harrisburg PA 17120

Susan Olsen
Voc Rehab/Dept of Human Serv
40 Fountain Street
Providence RI 02903

Paul Knight
SC Voc Rehab Dept
P O Box 15, 1410 Boston Ave
West Columbia SC 28171-0015

John Ellefson
Div of Rehab Services
700 North Governors Dr.
Pierre SD 57501-2275

Bill Wood
Div of Rehab Serv, Cit. Plz Bldg
400 Deaderick St. -- 15th fl
Nashville TN 37219

Ron Trull
Texas Rehab Commiasion
4900 N. Lamar
Austin TX 78751-2316

Cathy Chambless
Utah Supported Employment Program
660 South 200 East, Suite 440
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Mark Peterson
Dept of Rehab Services
4901 Fitzhugh Ave
Richmond VA 23230

Mikell Beckley & Bruce Nelson
Division of V. R./State Office Complex
102 S. Main St.
Waterbury VT 05676

Chuck Paeth
Div. of Voc Rehab
P.O. Box 1788/State Bldg. #2
Olympia WA 98504

Susan Kidder
Div of Voc Rehab
1 W. Wilson, Rm 850/P.O. Box 7852
Madison WI 53707

Janice Holland
Div of Rehab Services, Board of Rehab
State Capitol Complex
Charleston WV 25305

Alan Schultz
Dept of Health & Social Services
1100 Herschler Bldg
Cheyenne WY 82002